



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/814,373	03/31/2004	Andrew L. Oleson	1199 P 196	5499

26952 7590 11/25/2005

ROGER H. STEIN
Wallenstein Wagner & Rockey, Ltd.
311 S. WACKER DRIVE
53RD FLOOR
CHICAGO, IL 60606-6630

EXAMINER

FERGUSON, MARISSA L

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2854

DATE MAILED: 11/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/814,373	Applicant(s) OLESON, ANDREW L.	
	Examiner Marissa L. Ferguson	Art Unit 2854	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 August 2005.
 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 51, 52 and 59-80 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) ☒ Claim(s) 51, 52 and 71-80 is/are allowed.
 6) ☒ Claim(s) 59-70 is/are rejected.
 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 31 March 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. The finality of the last office action filed on 8/3/05 is withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 59,60,63-66 and 69 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in view of Rivin (2003/0185624) in view of Deschenes (US Publication 2002/0148172).

Regarding claims 59 and 65 Rivin teaches a method and apparatus comprising a set of uniform thickness (Page 2, Paragraph 0024, Lines 13-15) elastomeric shims (elements 12,13) and wherein each shim of each set adapted to be optionally positioned between a frame holder and the frame (Figure 2) such that the shims of a set can be used simultaneously with all of the frame holders in a number of different combinations to adjust and evenly increase the vertical distance between the frame and the item to be printed upon (this limitation is not positively claimed and the set of shims in the prior art has the capability of being simultaneously used in different combinations). However, Rivin does not teach a plurality of shims of different thicknesses.

Deschenes teaches a package/bundle of shims (18,28) with different thicknesses (Abstract and Page 2, Paragraph 0031). It would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention as taught by Rivin to have a plurality of shims of different thicknesses as taught by Deschenes, since Deschenes teaches that it is advantageous to have selectable thicknesses to provide an easier method of properly aligning shims.

Regarding claims 60 and 66, Rivin teaches a method and apparatus claimed with the exception of wherein each shim has a means associated therewith for interconnecting the shim to another shim and/or to a frame holder such as a contact area. Deschenes teaches a thin strip of wood (element 15 can function as the means for interconnection) that joins the surfaces of both shims together (Abstract and Paragraph 0032) and uses an adhesive tape (30) for holding shim assemblies of one row to another row during shipping. It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention as taught by Rivin to have an interconnection means as taught by Deschenes, since Deschenes teaches that it is advantageous to properly and effectively join the shims together in a secure manner.

Regarding claims 63,64 and 69 Rivin teaches a method and apparatus claimed with the exception of each set of shims or one or more sets having one or more shims and the first predetermined thickness can be the same or different than the second predetermined thickness. Deschenes teaches a bundle/package of shims (18,28) having different predetermined thicknesses (Abstract and Page 2, Paragraph 0031). Also, specifically regarding claim 70, Deschenes teaches a package of shims, which includes multiple sets of shims (3 or more as shown in figures 8 and 9). It would have

been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the invention as taught by Rivin to have a plurality of shims of different thicknesses as taught by Deschenes, since Deschenes teaches that it is advantageous to have selectable thicknesses to provide an easier method of properly aligning shims.

3. Claims 61,62,67 and 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over in view of Rivin (2003/0185624) in view of Deschenes (US Publication 2002/0148172) as applied to claims 59 and 65 above, and further in view of Ingold (US Patent 4,713,922).

Regarding claims 61 and 67, Rivin and Deschenes both teach the claimed method and invention with the exception of a method and apparatus comprising at least one fastener for each frame holder to interconnect the shims disposed between the frame and the frame holder either to each other and/or to the frame holder (The examiner would like to point out that the applicant has not positively claimed the frame and frame holder). Ingold teaches a frame mounting structure with at least one fastener for interconnecting sets of shims disposed between a door mounting unit (element 24 and Column 4, Lines 24-33 and Lines 52-63). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to further modify the invention as taught by Rivin to replace the interconnection thereof with a fastener interconnection as taught by Ingold, since Ingold teaches that it is advantageous to provide expandable shim surfaces to allow for the adjustment needed to provide a secure connection.

Regarding claims 62 and 68, Rivin and Deschenes both teach the claimed method and invention with the exception of a mechanism for holding the frame in the frame holder and the same mechanism will hold the frame and one or more shims in the frame holder below the frame and between the frame holder and the frame. (The examiner would like to point out that the applicant has not positively claimed the frame and frame holder). Ingold teaches a frame mounting structure wherein each frame structure includes a studding mechanism for interconnecting (7) for the one or more shims (12,14) in the mounting connection (Column 5, Lines 53-68 and Column 6, Lines 1-6). It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to further modify the invention as taught by Rivin to include a mechanism for holding the frame and the shims as taught by Ingold, since Ingold teaches that it is advantageous to provide a secure and permanent connection thereby preventing movement of the frame and shims.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claims 51,52 and 71-80 are allowed
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: Regarding claim 51, the prior art does not teach or render obvious a method for modifying an existing printing press to accept a pair of height-adjusting shims comprising the steps of: positioning each one of the pair of shims on each of a pair of opposed frame holders, determining at least one location for an aperture on each of the opposed frame holders to facilitate fastening of the pair of shims to the pair of opposed

frame holders, positioning a drill bit on each of the opposed frame holders at the determined location and drilling a hole in each of the opposed frame holders at the determined location.

Regarding claims 71 and 76, the prior art does not teach or render obvious a method for adjusting the vertical height of a frame for a screen supported by one or more frame holders relative to an item to be printed upon comprising the step of positioning the selected at least one set of shims simultaneously between a frame holder and the frame to adjust and evenly increase the vertical distance between the frame and the item to be printed upon.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 59-80 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2854

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marissa L. Ferguson whose telephone number is (571) 272-2163. The examiner can normally be reached on (M-T) 6:30am-4:00pm and every other (F) 7:30am-4:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Hirshfeld can be reached on (571) 272-2168. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Marissa L Ferguson
Examiner
Art Unit 2854

MLF


Daniel J. Colilla
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2854